

*Citation for published version:*

Miranda, D, Castillo, JC & Sandoval-Hernández, A 2020, 'Young Citizens Participation: Empirical Testing of a Conceptual Model', *Youth & Society*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 251-271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X17741024>

*DOI:*

[10.1177/0044118X17741024](https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X17741024)

*Publication date:*

2020

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Miranda, D, Castillo, JC & Sandoval-Hernández, A 2017, 'Young Citizens Participation: An empirical test of a conceptual model' *Youth & Society*. DOI: [org/10.1177/0044118X17741024](https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X17741024). Reprinted by permission of SAGE publications.

## University of Bath

### Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:  
[openaccess@bath.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@bath.ac.uk)

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Youth & Society

## Young Citizens Participation: Empirical testing of a conceptual model

Journal:	<i>Youth &amp; Society</i>
Manuscript ID	Y&S-17-0045.R1
Manuscript Type:	Review
Keywords:	Measurement Development, Political Behavior, Prosocial Involvement, Civic Engagement
Abstract:	A growing body of literature from different disciplines addresses concepts and measurement of citizenship. The present paper seeks to contribute to this field by examining the issue of youth citizenship from a comparative international perspective and proposing a simplified conceptual model that can be operationalized. This model includes a community dimension, which refers to individual's relationship with their community associations, and a civic dimension, concerning institutional processes such as voting and/or political activism. The model was tested using multi-group confirmatory factor analysis and measurement equivalence for 8th grade students (n=139.875) across the 38 countries that participated in the International Civic and Citizenship Study (2009). Our results find support for the proposed conceptual model and its invariance across countries, and we discuss the implications for theory and further research.

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Running head: YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Young Citizens Participation: Empirical testing of a conceptual model

For Peer Review

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

**Abstract**

A growing body of literature from different disciplines addresses concepts and measurement of citizenship. The present paper seeks to contribute to this field by examining the issue of youth citizenship from a comparative international perspective and proposing a simplified conceptual model that can be operationalized. This model includes a *community* dimension, which refers to individual's relationship with their community associations, and a *civic* dimension, concerning institutional processes such as voting and/or political activism. The model was tested using multi-group confirmatory factor analysis and measurement equivalence for 8<sup>th</sup> grade students (n=139.875) across the 38 countries that participated in the International Civic and Citizenship Study (2009). Our results find support for the proposed conceptual model and its invariance across countries, and we discuss the implications for theory and further research.

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Introduction

Participation in the public sphere is a cornerstone of citizenship in modern democratic systems, ranging from liberal conceptions of democracy based on voting to more diverse current forms of participation (Della Porta, 2013). Nevertheless, the increasing diversification of citizenship participation repertoires, particularly in the last decade, presents new challenges for understanding changing participation patterns (Van Deth, 2001) in light of certain paradoxical characteristics. That paradox refers, on the one hand, by decline in participation and disaffected attitudes regarding the electoral process and partisan membership, and on the other, by the emergence of newer forms of political activity as contentious participation or involvement in different types of social movements (Dalton, 2008; Ekman & Amnå, 2012; Putnam, 2001; Stolle & Hooghe, 2005; Wattenberg, 2009). These changing patterns of participation demand wider conceptual models of citizen participation as well as new approaches to operationalization and measurement (Albacete, 2014; Amnå, Ekström, Kerr, & Stattin, 2009; Ekman & Amnå, 2012; Fox, 2014; Hooghe, Hosch-Dayican, & van Deth, 2014; Theocharis & Van Deth, 2016; Turner, 1990; Van Deth, 2014).

New forms of participation are particularly salient in the case of young populations (Albacete, 2014; Hay, 2007; Marien, Hooghe, & Quintelier, 2010), whose lack of participation along traditional lines (such as voting) is becoming a global issue for the future functioning of current democratic systems (Abendschön, 2013; Albacete, 2014; Cox & Castillo, 2015; Van Deth, Abendschön, & Vollmar, 2011). The upcoming generational replacement has led social scientists as well as national and international agencies to prioritize understanding of political behavior among younger cohorts (Amnå et al., 2009; Blais & Rubenson, 2013; Flanagan &

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Levine, 2010; Flanagan & Sherrod, 1998; Gidengil, Wass, & Valaste, 2016; Hooghe, 2004; Keating, 2014; McIntosh & Youniss, 2010; Niemi & Hepburn, 1995; Quintelier, 2015). However, current approaches fail to linking theoretical conceptualization of youth citizenship participation to empirical measurement, as they focus mainly on adult population and the increasing complexity of participation turn the prospects of operationalization and measurement an increasing endeavor (Ekman & Amnå, 2012; Hoskins & Mascherini, 2009; Theocharis & Van Deth, 2016; Van Deth, 2001, 2014). Attending to this situation, the present paper attempts to develop a simplified framework for studying youth citizenship participation both conceptually and empirically. The analysis is informed by two research questions: 1) *What are the main dimensions of a broad concept of young citizens' participation?* And 2) *How can this concept of youth citizenship participation be comparably measured?* In short, this is a conceptual and methodological proposal for the measurement of young citizens' participation and its comparability across countries.

The paper aims to contribute to current research on comparative youth citizenship participation in three main respects. First, by proposing a conceptual model of youth citizenship participation that integrates current developments into comprehensive frameworks based on adult and youth populations. Second, the conceptual framework is operationalized with confirmatory measure to ensure its valid application to different contexts through measurement equivalence procedures (Davidov, Meuleman, Cieciuch, Schmidt, & Billiet, 2014; Millsap & Meredith, 2007; Millsap & Yun-Tein, 2004). And third, by using existing international publicly available data which means researchers from different countries can use this research tool. The data include the Civic Education Study (CIVED) (applied in 1998), the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) (applied in 2009), and the forthcoming ICCS 2016, all of them

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

implemented by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). These studies measure civic knowledge, attitudes, and citizenship behavior in countries in Europe, Latin America and Asia.

**Towards a Young Citizens Participation Model**

From the middle of the last century, there have been different approaches for the understanding of citizenship participation. Van Deth (2001) distinguishes several stages in this process. The main focus during the 1940’s and 1950’s was on voting, but by the 1970s, citizens were already exploring alternative modes of involvement in the public sphere, including unconventional forms of participation. From the 1990s onward, conceptual frameworks have generally encompassed “‘civil’ activities such as volunteering and social engagement” (van Deth, 2001, p. 6), and nowadays, it is also common to find references to online activities (Bennett, Wells, & Rank, 2009; Li & Marsh, 2008; Oser, Hooghe, & Marien, 2013; Theocharis, 2015; Theocharis & Van Deth, 2016). Nevertheless, as the online dimension is something that emerged recently, it remain less well incorporated in the available data of international comparative studies of youth participation, for that reason we restrict our definition to what is now sometimes called as “offline participation”.

In recent years, new and diverse forms of participation have continued to emerge, making this phenomenon more difficult to understand in any precise or parsimonious way (Hooghe et al., 2014; Theocharis & van Deth, 2016; van Deth, 2001, 2014). At present, the list of citizen participation activities is very extensive; the most common items include voting, party membership, protest, boycotting, contacting media, contacting authorities, political discussions, volunteering, donation, and community group membership. Based on these diverse activities,

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

scholars interpellate available conceptual models of citizenship to generate newer taxonomies (Fox, 2014; Reichert, 2016; Theocharis & van Deth, 2016; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Carpini, 2006) that take account of these different forms of citizen participation. These include conventional political participation, formal political participation, unconventional political participation, political protest, public voice, contentious politics, creative participation, consumerism participation, civic engagement, and social participation and/or community participation (Micheletti & McFarland, 2015; Putnam, 2001; Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, & Agrusti, 2016; Stolle, Hooghe, & Micheletti, 2005; Stolle & Micheletti, 2013; van Deth, 2001, 2014; Verba, Nie, & Kim, 1978).

In addressing the challenges of defining and studying participation, some scholars have adopted a broader perspective, using conceptual frameworks that look beyond the use of voting or party membership as key indicators (Ekman & Amnå, 2012; Hoskins, 2006; Hoskins, Janmaat, & Villalba, 2012; Hoskins, Villalba, & Saisana, 2012; Norris, 2011; Theocharis & Van Deth, 2016; Topf, 1998; Zukin et al., 2006). In pursuing a minimal version of forms of participation on the basis of the extant literature, two major groups can be identified: those that include the term ‘political’, and those labeled ‘civil’, ‘social’ or ‘community’. Here, we will argue that one way of grouping these within a single framework is to combine definitions that distinguish between traditional political participation and other types into a wider concept of *citizenship participation*. For present purposes, we understand citizenship participation as an umbrella term that encompasses diverse forms of active participation ranging from traditional voting to political activism and community activities.



YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

One widely accepted conception of political participation refers to activities that influence political decisions, related to government and/or the selection of representatives (Van Deth, 2001; Verba, Nie, & Kim, 1978). Accordingly, we take political participation to refer to spectrum of political activity that includes voting turnout, party membership and protest. In line with this approach, a predominant conception of traditional political participation in international educational studies is linked to the concept of civic education, which “focuses on knowledge and understanding of formal institutions and processes of civic life (such as voting in elections)” (Schulz, Fraillon, Ainley, J., Losito, B., & Kerr, 2008, p. 22). Traditionally, definitions of political and/or civic participation have excluded forms of participation oriented to community activities and civil or social associations, which were understood as nonpolitical in a traditional way. On the other hand, the concept of civic engagement, and the diffuse concepts of social and community participation have tended to exclude traditional political/voting participation forms (Ekman & Amnå, 2012). However, as noted by Ekman & Amnå (2012), more recent definitions of both political participation and civic engagement have sought to encompass almost every type of participation, making them too wide to inform empirical research on citizenship behavior.

In this context, one useful concept is the idea of active citizenship, defined by Hoskins as “participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy” (2006, p. 4). Other definitions have emphasized duty-based and engaged citizenship (Dalton, 2015), highlighting social concern for the welfare of others beyond formal political roles. Similarly, Zukin et al. (2016) identified conventional activities, community activities and public voice (i.e. protest or contacting representatives) as aspects of engagement in public life. In the same vein, educational research is moving toward a wider conception of citizenship that “focuses on knowledge and

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

understanding and on opportunities for participation and engagement in both civic and civil society. It is concerned with the wider range of ways that citizens use to interact with and shape their communities and societies” (Schulz et al., 2008, p. 22). Therefore, modern conceptions of citizen participation encompass both civic participation (as traditional political participation), and participation in civil society and the community as a political behavior.

The conceptual model proposed here follows Ekman & Amnå (2012) and Schulz et al (Schulz et al., 2016, 2008), who organized a wide range of activities along two main dimensions, which we call *community* and *civic participation*. The community dimension of participation refers to voluntary and personal activities such as improving local community conditions, charity work, or simply helping others. Such activities are not located or targeted to the sphere of government, state or politics, but are politically relevant because they address collective or community problems (Van Deth, 2014). The civic dimension of participation, was described in the citizenship education framework developed by Schulz et al. (2008, 2016), which is widely understood as referring to “all actions directed towards influencing governmental decisions and political outcomes” (Ekman & Amnå, 2012, p. 289) or, as Schulz et al. put it, “refers to the principles, mechanisms, and processes of decision making, participation, governance, and legislative control” (Schulz et al., 2016, p. 15). Within this dimension, we distinguish two sub-dimensions: the *formal participation* (the classic way of understanding citizenship situated in the political system as voting or party membership) and *activism* (which seeks to influence government or politics through unconventional, informal, or extra-parliamentary modes of participation, such as protests).

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

The proposed conceptual model of civic-community youth citizenship offers several advantages in terms of parsimony. First, it positions modes of participation such as formal-informal or conventional-unconventional as *civic*, based on the general idea that such activities seeks to influence government or political outcomes. Second, it positions participation in civil society as *community participation*, referring to community-based or face-to-face activities. In this sense, the proposed model of civic and community participation allows the main methods of participation in civil society and participation that influences the political system to be more accurately distinguished. We argue that both are constitutive of citizenship and that bringing both under one umbrella makes it possible to construct a more parsimonious account of youth participation.

**Operationalizing youth citizen participation**

Even more than in adult population, the lack of comprehensive framework capturing the diversity of young people’s participation repertoires clearly limits the scope of empirical research. Typically, description and measurement of citizenship participation has depended on a set of questions to quantify electoral turnout, rates of demonstration attendance and/or rates of political party membership (Van Deth, 2014). However, in the case of young people of school going age, one obvious problem is that they are not yet formally recognized as citizens; specifically, they have no voting rights, and they do not share adults’ options for participation. Nevertheless, students can manifest their intent to participate in the future and they can also participate in demonstrations or voluntary groups.

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

To address the issue of measurement, then, indicators of participation can be used as a proxy for community and civic participation (formal and activist). On that basis, we also consider another axis that has to date been largely neglected in research on youth participation: reported student participation at school and intended participation on entering adult life (Quintelier & Blais, 2015). The combination of reported/intended participation and community/civic participation (with sub-dimensions formal/activist) produces a 3x2 conceptual matrix for analyzing students' citizenship participation. Table 1 summarizes the different types of participation identified by this approach: reported community, formal, and activist participation, and intention to participate in community, formal, and activist modes in adult life. Identification of these six types of participation facilitates measurement and comparison of youth citizenship participation.

### Measurement and equivalence

In existing empirical research on citizen participation, two types of study can be identified. Person-centered studies attempt to classify individuals into distinct groups, using techniques such as cluster analysis or latent class analysis (see for instance Alvarez, Levin, & Nuñez, 2017; Hooghe & Oser, 2015; Oser, 2017; Oser et al., 2013, 2013; Reichert, 2016). This person-centered approach has attracted increasing attention over the last decade as a means of identifying types of citizen. The second approach is variable-oriented, seeking to capture and measure citizen participation and its dimensions using such techniques as exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis (see for instance Talò & Mannarini, 2014; Theocharis & van Deth,

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

2016). Given present purposes—that is, to identify the main dimensions of citizenship participation—the variable-oriented approach was considered appropriate.

The dimensions of citizenship participation are hypothetical constructs that cannot be directly observed; strictly, then, they are latent variables and should be measured accordingly (Albacete, 2014; Bollen, 2002; Quaranta, 2015). Latent variables are estimated on the basis of a set of observable indicators—that is, the hypothetical underlying constructs are captured by scales constructed using statistical techniques such as confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Bollen, 2002; Hoyle, 2014), an extended analytical strategy commonly used for such purposes.

In developing measures of social concepts, one of the main challenges is meaningful comparability (Davidov et al., 2014; Millsap & Meredith, 2007). In the case of international surveys, respondents speak different languages and are born and socialized in different socioeconomic, sociocultural, and sociopolitical contexts and conditions. For this reason, it becomes necessary to use techniques developed specifically to assess the target concepts and their comparability across divergent populations. In the last decade, social science research has utilized a set of statistical techniques that facilitate evaluation of comparability measurements (Davidov et al., 2014). Among these, multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (MGCFA) is widely used to assess measurement comparability, technically referred to as measurement invariance (Millsap, 2011) or measurement equivalence.

Within this framework, comparability is evaluated sequentially at different invariance levels. The basic level, configural invariance, assumes that, in all groups, latent variables entail the same indicator variables, and it is expected that the same latent model structure applies to all research population groups. This level of invariance confirms the same structure but “does not

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

warrant any between-group comparison of the construct the latent variable represents” (Beaujean, 2014, p. 59). The next level is metric (or weak) invariance, which is considered the minimal condition for comparing the relation between latent variables and observed variables across groups, and assumes that factor loadings are the same across groups (Beaujean, 2014; Davidov et al., 2014; Desa, 2014, 2016). Scalar (or strong) invariance assumes that intercepts or thresholds (for categorical variables) are the same across groups. This allows for valid comparison of the levels of latent variables among groups, as well as comparison of the relation of latent factors to observed variables, as in correlation or regression coefficients. While it is possible to establish the strict invariance level that tests equality of error variance across groups, the scalar level of invariance suffices for meaningful comparison of group means (Beaujean, 2014; Davidov, 2009).

Within this conceptual and technical framework, the general hypothesis tested here regarding measurement is that the latent variables of the civic and civil dimensions of youth citizenship participation can be confirmed and validly compared across countries.

### **Data, Variables and Methods**

The data come from the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2009, a comparative project coordinated by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). A stratified, multi-stage random sample of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students was selected from schools in 38 countries. In the first stage, around 150 schools were drawn in each country. In the second stage at least one whole class was selected from each school, with all the students in the classes participated in the study. The country samples are representative of

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

the entire population of 8<sup>th</sup> graders in each country (Schulz et al., 2008). Table 2 shows the distribution of students per country.

In order to handle the missing data, we used the full information maximum likelihood (FIML) method available in the software Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2015). This procedure allows for the inclusion of any case containing information for any variables included in the analyses. The final sample consisted of 139,875 students in 5,369 schools from 38 countries.

The variables used as indicators for the dimensions are related to the students' community and civic (formal and activist) participation, both in an future-intended sense as well as in their current lives. . Table 3 shows the items and answers for each type of participation. As there were not indicators for the 'reported activist participation in the ICCS 2009 dataset, this participation type was not estimated in the measurement model.

Methods of analysis

CFA, multi-group CFA and invariance tests were used to perform the analysis. Given the nested design of samples, estimates were specified to take account of complex sample design and sampling weights (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011). First, CFA was used to estimate the latent model for each country (Davidov, 2009). To evaluate the goodness of fit for each model, chi-squared testing was used as a first approach. Because of the sensitivity of this indicator to sample size, three other indicators were also used: comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). According to the criteria proposed by Brown (2006), the RMSEA cut-off point should be  $\leq .06$ . In the case of CFI and TLI the suggested criterion is closer to .95 or greater, although "CFI and TLI values in the range of .90 – .95 may be indicative of acceptable model fit" (Brown, 2006, p. 87). Second, the Multi-group

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

CFA estimates the fit of community-civic measurement model assuming ordered variables. This kind of analysis permits the evaluation of scale configuration in the different countries using Weighted Least Square Mean Variance (WLSMV) with robust estimation of standard errors (Desa, 2014, 2016; Meredith, 1993; Millsap & Meredith, 2007; Muthén & Muthén, 2015). Finally, in order to advance in the comparison between countries, we used an invariance test that examines the equivalence of measurement across the different countries, using CFI, TLI and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) to evaluate the different levels of invariance; configural, metric and scalar. Each model was evaluated observing the fit indexes criteria mentioned above. Additionally, we used the changes in the fit indexes between a higher level of invariance to a lower level, considering the criteria proposed by Rutkowski and Svetina (2014) for compare more than 20 groups, where  $|\Delta CFI| \leq 0.020$ ,  $|\Delta TLI| \leq 0.020$  and  $|\Delta RMSEA| \leq 0.020$  (Desa, 2014). The chi-square difference test was not used because of its sensitivity to large samples (Cheung & Rensvold, 2000; Davidov, 2009).

Descriptive analyses were performed using the Stata 14 statistical package and Mplus 7.4 software was used for the multi-group CFA. Replication materials are available on request or visiting the Open Science Framework website: <https://osf.io/6sq3j/>. These include the syntax for the invariant measurement model, enabling further analyses with the citizenship participation variables as endogenous or exogenous in the models. For researchers unfamiliar with this methodology, a second-best alternative is to use factor scores, which are also available in the replication materials by student ID that can then be merged with the ICCS dataset.



YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Results

This section shows firstly the general results regarding the extent to which the empirical indicators correspond to the theoretical citizenship participation construct, tested by CFA procedure for each country. Secondly, it reports the estimation of the multi-group analyses and the equivalence of measures across the countries tested. Finally, there is a brief description of the variability of participation patterns as well as the correlations among dimensions of the model.

Single country analyses

In accordance with the above criteria, CFA analyses confirmed the proposed measurement structure for community-formal-activist and intended-reported young citizens' participation for each country. The hypothetical five-factor model measuring youth citizenship participation received consistent empirical support.

Despite model confirmations, the fit indexes showed some variation across countries. While most countries show fit indexes above the cutoff points ( $RMSEA \leq .06$ ,  $CFI \geq 0.95$  and  $TLI \geq 0.95$ ), exceptions included Paraguay ( $CFI=0.948$  and  $TLI=0.939$ ) and Indonesia ( $CFI=0.943$  and  $TLI=0.932$ ) which are slightly below the cutoff for CFI and TLI. Nevertheless, the CFI and TLI fit indexes remain within an acceptable range (Brown, 2006).

Multi-group CFA and testing invariance

Multi-group CFA was used to test invariance estimates for parameters across countries. The results indicate a good fit of the configural model ( $\chi^2=29438.902$ ,  $df=6080$ ,  $p<0.001$ ,  $CFI=0.972$ ,  $TLI=0.967$ ,  $RMSEA=0.032$ ). This model fit information provided the baseline against which other levels of invariance were compared. The results indicate that specification of

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

the items forming the constructs has the same configuration across countries. The second MGCFA estimation for testing of metric invariance constrained factor loadings as equal across countries. The absolute results indicate that loadings were substantially invariant for the proposed model ( $\chi^2=41564.217$ ,  $df=6635$   $p<0.001$ , CFI=0.958, TLI=0.954, RMSEA=0.038) indicating that correlational analyses can be conducted comparably. In a relative comparison, the differences in CFI ( $\Delta=0.014$ ), TLI ( $\Delta=0.013$ ) and RMSEA ( $\Delta=0.006$ ) were within the range of the cut-off criterion. Finally, estimation for testing the scalar invariance, constraining the factor loading and thresholds, indicate that the tested model was acceptable ( $\chi^2=57849.957$ ,  $df=7597$   $p<0.001$ , CFI=0.940, TLI=0.943 RMSEA=0.042), following the criteria proposed by Brown (2006). Considering the comparative criteria, the model was also found to be invariant at this level as well, that is, the difference in the CFI ( $\Delta=0.018$ ), TLI ( $\Delta=0.011$ ) and RMSEA ( $\Delta=0.004$ ) was within the range of the cutoff criterion. Given this level of invariance, mean comparison and relational analysis comparison with the construct are allowed.

**Descriptive patterns**

Given that “scalar invariance guarantees that cross-country differences in the means of the observed items are a result of differences in the means of their corresponding constructs” (Davidov, 2009, p. 69), the description of levels for each participant country is allowed. While interpreting country differences is clearly beyond the scope of this paper, the scales created enable to explore the profile of citizen participation in each country and can serve to show the possibilities that these kind of comparisons offer for future research.

A first result to highlight is the proportion of variance linked to the country level (see Table 4). In order to describe the decomposition of variance, one multilevel model for each type

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

of participation was estimated, allowing to calculate the proportion of variance associated with each level of the analyses. As can be observed in table 4, all types of participation show relevant proportion of variance associated with the country level, particularly reported community participation (42.9%), reported formal participation (25.1%) and intended community participation (18.4%). A complementary result shows that the types of participation are correlated with different strengths among each other, but with medium to large effect sizes, which indicates that they do not function independently. For instance, as it is shown in Table 4, the highest correlations are actually between intended types of participation, whereas the lowest occur in general between intended and reported participation.

Discussion

This aim of this paper was to propose a conceptual model of youth citizenship participation and to test its operationalization and comparability with international survey data. The model was grounded in a theoretical framework offering a plausible and parsimonious concept of citizenship in terms of community and civic participation. The tested model considers community-based participation as well as civic participation (formal and activist) combined, taking into account intended participation in adult life and reported participation at school or at the local community. Within this framework, community participation is understood as community oriented and face-to-face, whereas civic participation involves influencing the political system through institutional participation and/or extra-institutional channels. The analyses were performed for 38 countries, using data from the ICCS study of 2009.

A first element to discuss refers to the relative weight of the contribution of this study in conceptual and in empirical/measurement terms. Although the approach is presented as top-

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

down, starting from available conceptual models of citizenship and their extension both to new participation forms as well as to youth population. It is clear that this exercise was constrained from the beginning by a bottom-up perspective, as we were well aware of the operationalization and measurement possibilities for international comparison given by ICCS. In this sense, we aimed at reaching a reasonable equilibrium between concepts and measurement, having as a trade-off that there evident conceptual vacuums (as online participation), as well as limitations of the current ICCS data to operationalize all proposed components of the conceptual model.

All in all, the proposed items were found to measure the constructs in an acceptable way for the countries analyzed. Additionally, the conceptual structure of citizenship participation proved to be invariant at the scalar level across those countries. These results suggest that all latent variables from community and civic intended and reported participation share the same structure. Moreover, their scalar invariant structure permits direct comparison of mean scores and correlates of the latent variables across countries (Beaujean, 2014; Davidov et al., 2014).

In conceptual terms, this wider parsimonious model of youth citizenship seems useful for theoretical and empirical analysis of the phenomenon in an international comparative setting. By comparison with previous models, it seems to more fully address the complexity of citizenship participation in a simpler way. Confirmation of the model's structure indicates that the specified dimensions are of use in evaluating participation in the school context and the expected participation during adult life.

There are some limitations that are worth mentioning in order to be considered by future studies. First, as the conceptual model capture only offline participation, precludes any discussion of the internet's role in diversification of participation repertoires (Theocharis, 2016:

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

2017). This is, on the one hand, given the lack of indicators in the data analyzed, but on the other, to the limitations of survey research itself to address this area of research. Secondly, the student’s age is an issue in terms of the implications of the results. The evidence supporting the conceptual model’s measurement structure is based on 8<sup>th</sup> grade students, which can be problematic two ways. The absence of legal-citizen status limits access to the full diversity of participation (such as voting or activism activities), and the meanings of those restricted forms of participation can be blurred in light of those unexperienced activities.

Additionally, it is relevant to mention that the proposed comparable scales can be used not only to assess levels of citizenship participation across countries and differential correlates of what constitutes a wider idea of citizenship. For instance, there is empirical evidence of differences in the adult population between developed and developing countries in terms of participation repertoires (Stockemer, 2015), therefore it would be interesting to assess whether these differences are already possible to detect at school age both in community and/or civic participation. Furthermore, the use of this model with international data as ICCS allows to incorporate country characteristics as related with differences in participation. For instance, are country context characteristics such as compulsory voting or inequality related to different participation forms and levels? This macro-micro research agenda is even more relevant when is considered the amount of variance in different types of participation associated with the country level. Lastly, another area of fruitful research refers to the association between participation and socioeconomic background variables (Marien et al., 2010; Schlozman, Verba, & Brady, 2012; Verba, Burns, & Schlozman, 2003; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995), which has barely been studied in youth population considering different participations forms international comparison.

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

## References

- Abendschön, S. (2013). *Growing into Politics: Contexts and Timing of Political Socialisation*. ECPR Press.
- Albacete, G. G. (2014). *Young People's Political Participation in Western Europe: Continuity or Generational Change?* Palgrave Macmillan.
- Alvarez, R. M., Levin, I., & Nuñez, L. (2017). Replication Data for: "The Four Faces of Political Participation in Argentina: Using Latent Class Analysis To Study Political Behavior." <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/2OFTAW>
- Amnå, E., Ekström, M., Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2009). Political socialization and human agency : The development of civic engagement from adolescence to adulthood. *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 111(1), 27–40. Retrieved from <http://oru.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A231686&dswid=469>
- Beaujean, A. A. (2014). *Latent Variable Modeling Using R: A Step-by-Step Guide*. Routledge.
- Bennett, W. L., Wells, C., & Rank, A. (2009). Young citizens and civic learning: two paradigms of citizenship in the digital age. *Citizenship Studies*, 13(2), 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020902731116>
- Blais, A., & Rubenson, D. (2013). The Source of Turnout Decline New Values or New Contexts? *Comparative Political Studies*, 46(1), 95–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414012453032>
- Bollen, K. A. (2002). Latent Variables in Psychology and the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 605–634. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135239>
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*. Guilford Press.
- Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2000). Assessing Extreme and Acquiescence Response Sets in Cross-Cultural Research Using Structural Equations Modeling. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(2), 187–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022100031002003>

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Cox, C., & Castillo, J. C. (Eds.). (2015). *Aprendizaje de la ciudadanía: contextos, experiencias y resultados*. Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile.

Curtis, J. E., Baer, D. E., & Grabb, E. G. (2001). Nations of Joiners: Explaining Voluntary Association Membership in Democratic Societies. *American Sociological Review*, 66(6), 783–805. doi:10.2307/3088873

Dalton, R. J. (2008). Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 76–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00718.x>

Dalton, R. J. (2015). *The Good Citizen; How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics; Second Edition* (2nd Revised ed. edition). CQ Press.

Davidov, E. (2009). Measurement Equivalence of Nationalism and Constructive Patriotism in the ISSP: 34 Countries in a Comparative Perspective. *Political Analysis*, 17(1), 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpn014>

Davidov, E., Meuleman, B., Cieciuch, J., Schmidt, P., & Billiet, J. (2014). Measurement equivalence in cross-national research. *Sociology*, 40. Retrieved from <http://www.annualreviews.org/eprint/dDDYVNPATzsgSDBcT3y6/full/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043137>

Della Porta, D. (2013). *Can Democracy Be Saved: Participation, Deliberation and Social Movements* (1 edition). Polity.

Desa, D. (2014). Evaluating measurement invariance of TALIS 2013 complex scales. Retrieved from [http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/evaluating-measurement-invariance-of-talis-2013-complex-scales\\_5jz2kbbvlb7k-en](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/evaluating-measurement-invariance-of-talis-2013-complex-scales_5jz2kbbvlb7k-en)

Desa, D. (2016). Understanding non-linear modeling of measurement invariance in heterogeneous populations. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, 1–25. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11634-016-0240-3>

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

- Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human Affairs*, 22(3), 283–300. Retrieved from <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/humaff.2012.22.issue-3/s13374-012-0024-1/s13374-012-0024-1.xml>
- Flanagan, C., & Levine, P. (2010). Civic Engagement and the Transition to Adulthood. *Future of Children*, 20(1), 159–179. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=49893069&lang=es&site=ehost-live>
- Flanagan, C., & Sherrod, L. (1998). Youth Political Development: An Introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 447–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01229.x>
- Fox, S. (2014). Is it Time to Update the Definition of Political Participation? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 67(2), 495–505. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gss094>
- Gidengil, E., Wass, H., & Valaste, M. (2016). Political Socialization and Voting: The Parent–Child Link in Turnout. *Political Research Quarterly*, 69(2), 373–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912916640900>
- Hay, C. (2007). *Why We Hate Politics*. Wiley.
- Hooghe, M. (2004). Political Socialization and the Future of Politics. *Acta Politica*, 39(4), 331–341. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.puc.cl/docview/217170293/abstract/A4F64FDB536046B2PQ/1>
- Hooghe, M., Hosch-Dayican, B., & van Deth, J. W. (2014). Conceptualizing political participation. *Acta Politica*, 49(3), 337–348. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ap.2014.7>
- Hooghe, M., & Oser, J. (2015). The rise of engaged citizenship: The evolution of citizenship norms among adolescents in 21 countries between 1999 and 2009. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 56(1), 29–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715215578488>



## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Hoskins, B. (2006). Draft framework on indicators for Active Citizenship. Ipsa:CRELL.

Hoskins, B., Janmaat, J. G., & Villalba, E. (2012). Learning citizenship through social participation outside and inside school: An international, multilevel study of young people's learning of citizenship. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 419–446.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.550271>

Hoskins, B., & Mascherini, M. (2009). Measuring Active Citizenship through the Development of a Composite Indicator. *Social Indicators Research*, 90(3), 459–488.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9271-2>

Hoskins, B., Villalba, C., & Saisana, M. (2012, January 13). The 2011 civic competence composite indicator (CCCI-2): measuring young people's civic competence across Europe based on the IEA international citizenship and civic education study [Monograph]. Retrieved February 23, 2017, from <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/208115/>

Hoyle, R. H. (2014). *Handbook of Structural Equation Modeling*. Guilford Publications.

Keating, A. (2014). *Education for Citizenship in Europe: European Policies, National Adaptations and Young People's Attitudes*. Springer.

Li, Y., & Marsh, D. (2008). New Forms of Political Participation: Searching for Expert Citizens and Everyday Makers. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(2), 247–272. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27568344>

Marien, S., Hooghe, M., & Quintelier, E. (2010). Inequalities in Non-institutionalised Forms of Political Participation: A Multi-level Analysis of 25 countries. *Political Studies*, 58(1), 187–213.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2009.00801.x>

McIntosh, H., & Youniss, J. (2010). Toward a Political Theory of Political Socialization of Youth. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth* (pp. 23–41). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470767603.ch1/summary>

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

- McFarland, D. A., & Thomas, R. J. (2006). Bowling young: How youth voluntary associations influence adult political participation. *American sociological review*, 71(3), 401–425.  
<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/71/3/401.short>. Accessed 21 March 2016
- Micheletti, M., & McFarland, A. S. (2015). *Creative Participation: Responsibility-Taking in the Political World*. Routledge.
- Millsap, R. E., & Meredith, W. (2007). Factorial invariance: Historical perspectives and new problems. *Factor Analysis at 100: Historical Developments and Future Directions*, 131–152. Retrieved from  
[https://books.google.cl/books?hl=en&lr=&id=aZRbBAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA131&dq=Factorial+invariance:+historical+perspectives+and+new+problems&ots=Nw2\\_L4MruR&sig=ZxNgjaGH80Lw4BVim0F5\\_DY3g1I](https://books.google.cl/books?hl=en&lr=&id=aZRbBAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA131&dq=Factorial+invariance:+historical+perspectives+and+new+problems&ots=Nw2_L4MruR&sig=ZxNgjaGH80Lw4BVim0F5_DY3g1I)
- Millsap, R. E., & Yun-Tein, J. (2004). Assessing factorial invariance in ordered-categorical measures. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(3), 479–515. Retrieved from  
[http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S15327906MBR3903\\_4](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S15327906MBR3903_4)
- Muthén, B., & Muthén, L. (2015). *Mplus User's Guide* (Seventh Edition). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Niemi, R., & Hepburn, M. (1995). The Rebirth of Political Socialization. *Perspectives on Political Science*, 24(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10457097.1995.9941860>
- Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oser, J. (2017). Assessing How Participators Combine Acts in Their “Political Tool Kits”: A Person-Centered Measurement Approach for Analyzing Citizen Participation. *Social Indicators Research*, 133(1), 235–258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1364-8>
- Oser, J., Hooghe, M., & Marien, S. (2013). Is Online Participation Distinct from Offline Participation? A Latent Class Analysis of Participation Types and Their Stratification. *Political Research Quarterly*, 66(1), 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912912436695>

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Putnam, R. D. (2001). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (1st edition). New York: Touchstone Books by Simon & Schuster.

Quaranta, M. (2015). *Political Protest in Western Europe: Exploring the Role of Context in Political Action*. Springer.

Quintelier, E. (2015). Engaging Adolescents in Politics: The Longitudinal Effect of Political Socialization Agents. *Youth & Society*, 47(1), 51–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X13507295>

Quintelier, E., & Blais, A. (2015). Intended and Reported Political Participation. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, edv017. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edv017>

Reichert, F. (2016). Students’ perceptions of good citizenship: a person-centred approach. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19(3), 661–693. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-016-9342-1>

Rutkowski, L., & Svetina, D. (2014). Assessing the Hypothesis of Measurement Invariance in the Context of Large-Scale International Surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 74(1), 31–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164413498257>

Schlozman, K. L., Verba, S., & Brady, H. E. (2012). *The Unheavenly Chorus: Unequal Political Voice and the Broken Promise of American Democracy*. Princeton University Press.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., & Fraillon, J. (2011). ICCS 2009 Technical Report. *International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED544622>

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2016). *Assesment framework: IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016*. IEA. Retrieved from [http://iccs.iea.nl/fileadmin/templates/IEA-ResWeb/images/Publications/IEA\\_ICCS\\_2016\\_Framework.pdf](http://iccs.iea.nl/fileadmin/templates/IEA-ResWeb/images/Publications/IEA_ICCS_2016_Framework.pdf)

Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B., & Kerr, D. (2008). International Civic and Citizenship Education Study. *ICCS-IEA*.

Stockemer, D. (2015). Turnout in developed and developing countries Are the two turnout functions different or the same? *Political Science*, 67(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032318715585033>

## YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

- Stolle, D., & Hooghe, M. (2005). Inaccurate, Exceptional, One-Sided or Irrelevant? The Debate about the Alleged Decline of Social Capital and Civic Engagement in Western Societies. *British Journal of Political Science*, 35(1), 149–167. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123405000074>
- Stolle, D., Hooghe, M., & Micheletti, M. (2005). Politics in the Supermarket: Political Consumerism as a Form of Political Participation. *International Political Science Review / Revue Internationale de Science Politique*, 26(3), 245–269. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30039032>
- Stolle, D., & Micheletti, M. (2013). *Political Consumerism: Global Responsibility in Action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Talò, C., & Mannarini, T. (2014). Measuring Participation: Development and Validation the Participatory Behaviors Scale. *Social Indicators Research*, 123(3), 799–816. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0761-0>
- Theocharis, Y. (2015). The Conceptualization of Digitally Networked Participation. *Social Media + Society*, 1(2), 2056305115610140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115610140>
- Theocharis, Y., & Van Deth, J. (2016). The continuous expansion of citizen participation: a new taxonomy. *European Political Science Review*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773916000230>
- Topf, R. (1998). Beyond Electoral Participation. In H.-D. Klingemann & D. Fuchs (Eds.), *Citizens and the State* (pp. 52–90). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/0198294735.001.0001/acprof-9780198294733-chapter-3>
- Turner, B. S. (1990). Outline of a Theory of Citizenship. *Sociology*, 24(2), 189–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038590024002002>
- Van Deth, J. (2001). Studying political participation: towards a theory of everything. Presented at the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops.

YOUNG CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

Van Deth, J. (2014). A conceptual map of political participation. *Acta Politica*, 49(3), 349–367.  
<https://doi.org/10.1057/ap.2014.6>

Van Deth, J., Abendschön, S., & Vollmar, M. (2011). Children and Politics: An Empirical Reassessment of Early Political Socialization. *Political Psychology*, 32(1), 147–174.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00798.x>

Verba, S., Burns, N., & Schlozman, K. L. (2003). Unequal at the starting line: Creating participatory inequalities across generations and among groups. *The American Sociologist*, 34(1–2), 45–69.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-003-1005-y>

Verba, S., Nie, N. H., & Kim, J. (1978). *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven-nation Comparison*. University of Chicago Press.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics* (Vol. 4). Cambridge Univ Press. Retrieved from  
<http://journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid=6272664>

Wattenberg, M. P. (2009). *Where Have All the Voters Gone?* Harvard University Press.

Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Carpini, M. X. D. (2006). *A New Engagement?: Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen*. Oxford University Press.

	Community Participation	Formal Participation	Civic Activist Participation
Intended	<i>Intended Community Participation</i>	<i>Intended Formal Participation</i>	<i>Intended Activist Participation</i>
Reported	<i>Reported Community Participation</i>	<i>Reported Formal Participation</i>	<i>Reported Activist Participation</i>

Hypothetical Citizenship Participation types

233x77mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Peer Review

Country	n	Country	n	Country	n
Austria	3368	Greece	3139	Netherlands	1917
Belgium-flemish	2966	Guatemala	3998	New Zealand	3930
Bulgaria	3248	Hong Kong SAR	2821	Norway	2983
Chile	5182	Indonesia	5038	Paraguay	3382
Chinese Taipei	5153	Ireland	3348	Poland	3247
Colombia	6194	Italy	3363	Russian Federation	4294
Cyprus	3145	Korea	5250	Slovak Republic	2968
Czech Republic	4626	Latvia	2744	Slovenia	3060
Denmark	4374	Liechtenstein	356	Spain	3293
Dominican Republic	4536	Lithuania	3896	Sweden	3432
England	2900	Luxembourg	4817	Switzerland	2918
Estonia	2724	Malta	2138	Thailand	5263
Finland	3297	Mexico	6567		

Participants for each country  
232x123mm (96 x 96 DPI)



	Community Participation	Formal Participation	Activist Participation
<b>Intended...</b>			
a) Listed below are different actions that you as a young person could take during the next few years. <b>What do you expect that you will do?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volunteer time to help people in the &lt;local community&gt;</li> <li>Talk to others about your views on political and social issues</li> <li>Contribute to an online discussion forum about social and political issues</li> <li>Join an organization for a political or social cause</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vote in local elections</li> <li>Vote in national elections</li> <li>Get information about candidates before voting in an election</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Write a letter to a newspaper</li> <li>Contacting an &lt;elected representative&gt;</li> <li>Taking part in a peaceful march or rally</li> <li>Collecting signatures for a petition</li> </ul>
b) Listed below are different ways adults can take an active part in political life. <b>When you are an adult, what do you think you will do?</b>			
c) There are many different ways how citizens may protest against things they believe are wrong. <b>Would you take part in any of the following forms of protest in the future?</b>			
Response scale:			
1. I will certainly not do this			
2. I will probably not do this			
3. I will probably do this			
4. I will certainly do this			
<b>Reported...</b>			
a) Have you ever got involved in the activities of any of the following organizations, clubs, or groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A youth organization</li> <li>A environmental organization</li> <li>A voluntary group doing something to help the community</li> <li>An organization collecting money for a social cause</li> <li>A cultural organization based on ethnicity</li> <li>A religious group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Voting for &lt;class representative&gt; or &lt;school parliament&gt;</li> <li>Taking part in decision making about how the school is run</li> <li>Becoming a candidate for class representative or school parliament</li> </ul>	
b) At school, have you ever done any of the following activities?			
Response scale:			
1. No, I have never done this			
2. Yes, I have done this but more than a year ago			
3. Yes, I have done this within the last twelve months			

Set of indicators used to measure the types of participation

165x187mm (96 x 96 DPI)



	1	2	3	4	5
1. Intended Community Participation	--				
2. Intended Formal Participation	0.617	--			
3. Intended Activist Participation	0.794	0.574	--		
4. Reported Community Participation	0.539	0.312	0.460	--	
5. Reported Formal Participation	0.369	0.354	0.364	0.465	--
General Mean	2.215	1.947	2.038	2.007	1.826
Standard deviation	0.674	1.621	0.764	0.743	0.796
Intraclass correlation (ICC) at country level	18.4%	11.7%	15.0%	42.9%	25.1%

Correlations between types of participation

220x64mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Or  
Peer  
Review